1 2 3 4 5 6 7	WILLIAM R. TAMAYO - #084965 (CA) DAVID OFFEN-BROWN - #063321 (CA) RAYMOND T. CHEUNG - #176086 (CA) EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY C San Francisco District Office 350 The Embarcadero, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94105-1260 Telephone No. (415) 625-5649 Facsimile No. (415) 625-5657 raymond.cheung@eeoc.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff	OMMISSION	
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11			
12	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY )	CIVIL ACTION NO.	
13	COMMISSION		
14	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT Civil Rights	
15	v. ()	<ul><li>– Employment Discrimination</li><li>– Class Action</li></ul>	
16 17	AMELCO ELECTRIC SAN FRANCISCO AND AMELCO CORPORATION,	JURY TRIAL DEMAND	
18	Defendant.		
19			
20	NATURE OF THE ACTION		
21	This is an action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title I of the Civil		
22	Rights Act of 1991 to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of sex, race and		
23	national origin, and to provide appropriate relief to Susanna Ortez and similarly situated		
24	individuals who were adversely affected by such practices. As alleged below, defendants,		

COMPLAINT

25

26

27

28

Amelco Electric San Francisco and Amelco Corporation subjected Ms. Ortez and others to a

hostile work environment because of their sex, race and/or national origin. Defendants also

termination because of their sex, race and/or national origin.

subjected Ms. Ortez and the class of similarly situated individual to disparate treatment and/or

# JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§451, 1331, 1337, 1343, and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (Title VII), 42 U.S.C. §§2000e-5(f)(1) and (3), and Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. §1981a.
- 2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within San Francisco County which is within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

## INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

3. This case is appropriate for assignment to San Francisco because the unlawful employment practices alleged were committed within San Francisco County.

#### **PARTIES**

- 4. Plaintiff, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), is the agency of the United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of Title VII and is expressly authorized to bring this action by sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).
- 5. At all relevant times, Defendant, Amelco Electric San Francisco, has continuously been doing business in the State of California and the City and County of San Francisco and has continuously had at least fifteen employees.
- 6. At all relevant times, Defendant, Amelco Corporation, has continuously been doing business in the State of California and the City and County of San Francisco and has continuously had at least fifteen employees.
- 7. At all relevant times, Amelco Electric San Francisco and Amelco Corportation ("Defendant Employers") have continuously been employers engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of section 701(b), (g), and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-(b), (g), and (h).

27 ///

28 ///

COMPLAINT

### **STATEMENT OF CLAIMS**

- 8. More than thirty days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Susanna Ortez filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC alleging violations of Title VII by Defendant Employers. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.
- 9. Since at least January 2002, Defendant Employers have engaged in unlawful practices at their San Francisco, California work site in violation of section 703(a)(1) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a). These practices include subjecting Ms. Ortez and other similarly situated employees to harassment and to an offensive, abusive, intimidating and hostile work environment based on their sex, race and/or national origin. Defendants also subjected Ms. Ortez and the class of similarly situated individual to disparate treatment and/or termination because of their sex, race and/or national origin.
- 10. The effect of the practices complained of above has been to deprive Susanna Ortez and others of equal employment opportunities and otherwise to adversely affect their status as employees because of their sex, race and/or national origin.
  - 11. The unlawful employment practices complained of above were intentional.
- 12. The unlawful employment practices complained of above were done with malice and/or reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Susanna Ortez and other similarly situated individuals.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant Employers, their officers, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in harassment and retaliation, and any other employment practice which discriminates on the basis of sex, race or national origin.
- B. Order Defendant Employers to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for racial and ethnic minority and/or female employees and which eradicate the effects of their past and present unlawful employment practices.

COMPLAINT

- C. Order Defendant Employers to make whole Susanna Ortez and other similarly situated individuals, by providing appropriate backpay with prejudgment interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices, including but not limited to interest.
- D. Order Defendant Employers to make whole Susanna Ortez and other similarly situated individuals by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described above, with interest, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- E. Order Defendant Employers to make whole Susanna Ortez and other similarly situated individuals by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses caused by the above unlawful conduct, including pain and suffering, emotional distress, indignity, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of self-esteem, and humiliation, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- F. Order Defendant Employers to pay Susanna Ortez and other similarly situated individuals punitive damages for its malicious and reckless conduct described above, in amounts to be determined at trial.
  - G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems proper.
  - H. Award the Commission its costs in this action.

#### JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES L. LEE DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL

GWENDOLYN YOUNG REAMS ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

1801 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20507

COMPLAINT

	WILLIAM R. TAMAYO Regional Attorney
Dated:	DAVID OFFEN-BROWN Supervisory Trial Attorney
	Supervisory Trial Actionicy
Dated:	RAYMOND T. CHEUNG Trial Attorney
	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION San Francisco District Office 350 The Embarcadero, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94105-1260
COMPLAINT	
	5